Index to Minutes of Meeting
The Commission of Fine Arts
13 April 1955

American Battle Monuments Commission
American Military Cemetery-Hamm, Luxembourg
Selection of artists for memorial chapel 14
Artists in Public Buildings, Use of
See General Services Administration 3

Commission of Fine Arts
Limit of Authorization, increase in 2
Constitution Avenue Bridge/Tunnel
Discussion with Nat. Capital Planning Commission 6

Decoration of Public Buildings, funds for the
See General Services Administration

Gallaudet College
Library building - preliminary plans 10
General Services Administration
Policy with relation to Commission of Fine Arts 3
Use of artists in public buildings 3
Allocation of funds for decoration of public buildings 4
Removal of Temporary Buildings 5
Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants
Appointment of new members 2
Gift to the United States
Gift from the German people 16

Howard University
Auditorium of Fine Arts - preliminary plans 10

Legislation
HR 4534 and S. 1413/84th C. to amend CFA enabling Act 14
HR 2968 and HR 3110/84th C. Removal of Temp. bldgs. 14
HR 4687/84th C. GSA to dispose of certain real property 15
HR 4913/84th C. to establish a National Arts Foundation 16

Postage Stamps
Advisory Committee on design 16

Shipstead-Luce Act Submissions
SL 1738, 1740, 1741 and 1749 approved 13
SL 1739 no action taken 13

Temporary Buildings, removal of
See General Services Administration

Washington Monument, Lighting of 13
White House, plans to enlarge Executive Offices 11
Woman's Bureau, Police Department
Detention House- revised plans for 9
Woodbridge Branch Public Library
Revised plans for 9

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., 13 APRIL 1955

A meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its offices in the Interior Department Building on Wednesday, 13 April 1955. The following members were present:

David E. Finley, Chairman
Felix W. de Weldon
Wallace K. Harrison
Emily L. Muir
Douglas W. Orr
Elbert Peets
also Linton R. Wilson, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

Mr. George Garrett of the Federal City Council attended the meeting at the invitation of the Chairman.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 9:30 a. m.

Proceedings:

1. MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF 2 DECEMBER 1954, 10 FEBRUARY 1955 AND 15 MARCH 1955: The Secretary reported that the minutes of the meetings of 2 December 1954 and 10 February 1955 had been mailed to the former members of the Commission. Their approval had not yet been registered. Due to pressure of back work, the minutes of the meeting of 15 March 1955 have not been distributed to the present members.

2. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 5 May, and 8 and 9 June 1955 were selected as the dates for the next meetings. On one of these dates it was hoped the President could receive the Commission. A definite time was to be arranged by the Commission through Mr. Bernard Shanley, Secretary to the President of the United States.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., 13 APRIL 1955

A meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its offices in the Interior Department Building on Wednesday, 13 April 1955. The following members were present:

David E. Finley, Chairman
Felix W. de Weldon
Wallace K. Harrison
Emily L. Muir
Douglas W. Orr
Hibert Peebs
also Linton L. Wilson, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

Mr. George Garrett of the Federal City Council attended the meeting at the invitation of the Chairman.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 9:30 a. m.

Proceedings:

1. MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF 2 DECEMBER 1954, 10 FEBRUARY 1955 AND 15 MARCH 1955: The Secretary reported that the minutes of the meetings of 2 December 1954 and 10 February 1955 had been mailed to the former members of the Commission. Their approval had not yet been registered. Due to pressure of back work, the minutes of the meeting of 15 March 1955 have not been distributed to the present members.

2. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 5 May, and 8 and 9 June 1955 were selected as the dates for the next meetings. On one of these dates it was hoped the President could receive the Commission. A definite time was to be arranged by the Commission through Mr. Bernard Shanley, Secretary to the President of the United States.

3. COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS - LIMIT OF AUTHORIZATION: The Chairman explained the background of the pending legislation to increase the limit of authorization of the Commission of Fine Arts, bringing out that the original authorization was for $10,000. Since 1920 the Commission's annual appropriations exceeded that amount. For fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956, the amount requested was $21,200. In 1956, the Chairman of the Appropriation Committees of both the House and Senate requested that steps be taken to amend the Act to increase the $10,000 limit of authorization.

The National Park Service had consented to include such an item in any omnibus bill they should send to Congress but they had not done so to date. Lacking assurance when such a bill would be forwarded, it was decided to initiate separate legislation. The Bureau of the Budget concurred in this action, and letters were sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House enclosing a draft bill (Exhibit A).

Subsequently, Senator Theodore F. Green and Congressman Frank Thompson, Jr., introduced the draft as S. 1413 and H. R. 4534 in the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. Action on the bills was still pending.

4. BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANTS FOR GEORGETOWN: At the request of the Secretary, the American Institute of Architects furnished the Commission with a list of names considered suitable for appointment to the Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown as replacements for two of the original members of the Board who had been serving in excess of four years.

Two new members were selected. They were: Mr. Louis A. Simon, to serve for a two-year term, and Miss Gertrude Sawyer, to serve for a one-year term. Mr. Walter G. Peter, Jr. was reappointed as Chairman for a

3. COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS - LIMIT OF AUTHORIZATION: The Chairman explained the background of the pending legislation to increase the limit of authorization of the Commission of Fine Arts, bringing out that the original authorization was for $10,000. Since 1920 the Commission's annual appropriations exceeded that amount. For fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956, the amount requested was $21,200. In 1956, the Chairman of the Appropriation Committees of both the House and Senate requested that steps be taken to amend the Act to increase the $10,000 limit of authorization.

The National Park Service had consented to include such an item in any omnibus bill they should send to Congress but they had not done so to date. Lacking assurance when such a bill would be forwarded, it was decided to initiate separate legislation. The Bureau of the Budget concurred in this action, and letters were sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House enclosing a draft bill (Exhibit A).

Subsequently, Senator Theodore F. Green and Congressman Frank Thompson, Jr., introduced the draft as S. 1413 and H. R. 4534 in the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. Action on the bills was still pending.

4. BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANTS FOR GEORGETOWN: At the request of the Secretary, the American Institute of Architects furnished the Commission with a list of names considered suitable for appointment to the Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown as replacements for two of the original members of the Board who had been serving in excess of four years.

Two new members were selected. They were: Mr. Louis A. Simon, to serve for a two-year term, and Miss Gertrude Sawyer, to serve for a one-year term. Mr. Walter G. Peter, Jr. was reappointed as Chairman for a

three-year term. It was decided to send letters of appreciation to the former members, Mr. Walter M. Macomber, and Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow, who both served since October, 1950.

5. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY WITH RELATION TO THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: Mr. Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator, and Mr. Peter A. Strobel, Commissioner of Public Buildings, both of General Services Administration, joined the Commission meeting at the invitation of the Chairman to discuss ways in which the Commission could be of help to the General Services Administration in connection with the following problems:

(a) USE OF SCULPTORS AND PAINTERS IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Mr. Mansure felt that the Commission "could be very helpful in connection with suggestions for the use of sculptors and painters in the decoration of public buildings from the standpoint of the background of the individuals and what they stand for." He pointed out that the General Services Administration has been subjected to severe criticism on some controversial work in certain buildings. A desire was expressed by Mr. Mansure to prevent a recurrence.

Mr. Strobel recalled such an issue where specific legislation would have been necessary to give the General Services Administration authority to remove a questionable mural. "Our General Council has ruled that we cannot undertake any removal of existing murals," he stated.

Chairman Finley assured the General Services Administration's representatives that the Commission would comment on the competence of painters, sculptors, and architects whose names had been chosen by the General Services Administration. He made it clear, however, that the

three-year term. It was decided to send letters of appreciation to the former members, Mr. Walter M. Kecomber, and Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow, who both served since October, 1950.

3. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY WITH RELATION TO THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: Mr. Edmund F. Manwaring, Administrator, and Mr. Peter A. Strobel, Commissioner of Public Buildings, both of General Services Administration, joined the Commission meeting at the invitation of the Chairman to discuss ways in which the Commission could be of help to the General Service Administration in connection with the following problems:

(a) USE OF SCULPTORS AND PAINTERS IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Mr. Manwaring felt that the Commission "could be very helpful in connection with suggestions for the use of sculptors and painters in the decoration of public buildings from the standpoint of the background of the individuals and what they stand for." He pointed out that the General Services Administration has been subjected to severe criticism on some controversial work in certain buildings. A desire was expressed by Mr. Manwaring to prevent a recurrence.

Mr. Strobel recalled such an issue where specific legislation would have been necessary to give the General Services Administration authority to remove a questionable mural. "Our General Counsel has ruled that we cannot undertake any removal of existing murals," he stated.

Chairman Finley assured the General Services Administration's representatives that the Commission would comment on the competence of painters, sculptors, and architects whose names had been chosen by the General Services Administration. He made it clear, however, that the

Commission's policy, up to the present, had been not to make initial recommendations. It is not the duty of the Commission to review the artist from a security angle. He suggested that outside organizations of artists, such as the National Academy of Design, might be of help in recommending artists to execute works in the decoration of public buildings.

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR ARTISTIC DECORATION OF BUILDINGS: In discussing this subject, Mr. Strobel pointed out that, at the present time, their estimates of costs for new building projects must be passed on by the Bureau of the Budget. No allowance is made for artistic embellishment in those buildings. Mr. Harrison mentioned that at one time there were provisions made to spend one percent of the total cost of a building for decoration, but that was stopped during World War II. Mr. Strobel was in favor of having that provision restored provided it would be flexible enough to adjust cases where one percent of the total cost of a building would be in excess of the amount needed to decorate the building, or to increase the amount in cases where the one percent would be inadequate.

Another point made by Mr. Strobel referred to the recently enacted Government purchase contract law whereby the Government may borrow money for the construction of a building which is leased to private ownership. The rent for the building is used to pay back the loan. During the term of amortization, the building stays in private ownership, and, theoretically, does not become Government-owned property until the loan is paid in full. Since the Government does not own the building, it cannot have full control to say how the building should be designed or decorated.

full control to say how the building should be designed or decorated. in full. Since the Government does not own the building, it cannot have really, does not become Government-owned property until the loan is paid of amortization, the building stays in private ownership, and, theoreti- The rent for the building is used to pay back the loan. During the term for the construction of a building which is leased to private ownership. Government purchase contract law whereby the Government may borrow money

Another point made by Mr. Strobel referred to the recently enacted would be in excess of the amount needed to decorate the building, or to increase the amount in cases where the one percent would be inadequate. enough to adjust cases where one percent of the total cost of a building favor of having that provision restored provided it would be flexible decoration, but that was stopped during World War II. Mr. Strobel was in provisions made to spend one percent of the total cost of a building for in those buildings. Mr. Harrison mentioned that at one time there were the Bureau of the Budget. No allowance is made for artistic embellishment their estimates of costs for new building projects must be passed on by discussing this subject, Mr. Strobel pointed out that, at the present time,

(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR ARTISTIC DECORATION OF BUILDINGS: In recommending artists to execute works in the decoration of public buildings.

(c) DEMOLITION OF TEMPORARY WAR BUILDINGS: The General Services Administration has had to tolerate the tempos because the use of tempos is perpetuated by the demand for space, which exceeds that available in other Government-owned or leased buildings. It was brought out by Mr. Mansure and Mr. Strobel that the space the tempos provide is subgrade as compared to the efficiency of new buildings, but it is more efficient to maintain and operate than rented space. The Fine Arts Commission has always considered the tempos as obstructions marring the planned view of public buildings, grounds, and memorials, which is its function to preserve.

Mr. Mansure asked the advice of the Commission as to the most objectionable tempo, from a location standpoint. The Commission unanimously concurred with Mr. Finley's nomination of the building at the head of Pennsylvania Avenue, between 14th and 15th Streets, Northwest. As another choice, Mr. Peets recommended the buildings "that cut off the view of the base of the Washington Monument from the Lincoln Memorial." He added the specific suggestion, "If a section of . . . a couple of hundred feet were cut out of it . . . you could see through it." Mr. Mansure approved by saying, "that is what we would like to get your advice on. That is where you can be very helpful." He further stated, "We didn't expect to get the formal recommendations right now."

More discussion followed, during which Mr. Strobel mentioned, "there is an amendment to our present law pending which makes it obligatory on our part to remove an equal amount of space in the tempos as we build down in the Southwest." However, funds for more new space and authorization to tear down the tempos are two important problems to the General Services Administration. Mr. Strobel indicated that without "direct authority to

(c) DEMOLITION OF TEMPORARY WAR BUILDINGS: The General Services Administration has had to tolerate the temps because the use of temps is perpetuated by the demand for space, which exceeds that available in other Government-owned or leased buildings. It was brought out by Mr. Hansure and Mr. Strobel that the space the temps provide is substrade as compared to the efficiency of new buildings, but it is more efficient to maintain and operate than rented space. The Fine Arts Commission has always considered the temps as obstructions marring the planned view of public buildings, grounds, and memorials, which is its function to preserve.

Mr. Hansure asked the advice of the Commission as to the most objectionable temps, from a location standpoint. The Commission unanimously concurred with Mr. Finley's nomination of the building at the head of Pennsylvania Avenue, between 14th and 15th Streets, Northwest. As another choice, Mr. Peets recommended the buildings "that cut off the view of the base of the Washington Monument from the Lincoln Memorial." He added the specific suggestion, "If a section of . . . a couple of hundred feet were cut out of it . . . you could see through it." Mr. Hansure approved by saying, "that is what we would like to get your advice on. That is where you can be very helpful." He further stated, "We didn't expect to get the formal recommendations right now."

More discussion followed, during which Mr. Strobel mentioned, "there is an amendment to our present law pending which makes it obligatory on our part to remove an equal amount of space in the temps as we build down in the Southwest." However, funds for more new space and authorization to tear down the temps are two important problems to the General Services Administration. Mr. Strobel indicated that without "direct authority to

tear down these tempos," the General Services Administration is obliged to put people now in rented space into them.

The need for parking seemed to outweigh the proposal made by the Chairman that a plan be made to return to Government operation as a park, as was originally intended, the Great Plaza surrounding the Oscar S. Straus Memorial Fountain at 14th Street, between E Street and Constitution Avenue, Northwest. The Chairman explained that it was his impression that the land had been leased by the Government to a commercial agency for use as a parking lot. Mr. Mansure said he would look into the matter, since he was not familiar with the case.

6. CONSTITUTION AVENUE BRIDGE/TUNNEL: Chairman Finley welcomed Mr. John Nolen, Jr., Director, National Capital Planning Commission. He asked Mr. Nolen to comment on the last meeting of his Commission and the present status of their position on the proposed Constitution Avenue Bridge legislation. Mr. Nolen reviewed the results of previous meetings and discussions saying last fall, the National Park Service sponsored a meeting, at which representatives of the National Capital Planning Commission were present, to hear Mr. Ole Singstad, Bridge and Tunnel Expert of New York, present his case in favor of a tunnel crossing at Constitution Avenue, Northwest.

As a result of that meeting, Mr. Singstad made an official presentation to the National Capital Planning Commission of his plans which he subsequently developed to show how practical a tunnel was, in profile, and as to the design of interchanges on both shores.

As a result, the Planning Commission passed a resolution in February, that the "Commission looks with interest on the proposed tunnel crossing

that the "Commission looks with interest on the proposed tunnel crossing

As a result, the Planning Commission passed a resolution in February, as to the design of interchanges on both shores.

subsequently developed to show how practical a tunnel was, in profile, and tion to the National Capital Planning Commission of his plans which he

which representatives of the National Capital Planning Commission were present, to hear Mr. Ole Singstad, Bridge and Tunnel Expert of New York, present his case in favor of a tunnel crossing at Constitution Avenue, Northwest.

As a result of that meeting, Mr. Singstad made an official presenta-

sions saying last fall, the National Park Service sponsored a meeting, at

lation. Mr. Nolan reviewed the results of previous meetings and discus-

absence of their position on the proposed Constitution Avenue Bridge Legis-

Mr. Nolan to comment on the last meeting of his Commission and the present

John Nolan, Jr., Director, National Capital Planning Commission. He asked

6. CONSTITUTION AVENUE BRIDGE/TUNNEL: Chairman Finley welcomed Mr.

he was not familiar with the case.

as a parking lot. Mr. Manvare said he would look into the matter, since

the land had been leased by the Government to a commercial agency for use

Avenue, Northwest. The Chairman explained that it was his impression that

Stevens Memorial Fountain at 14th Street, between E Street and Constitution

as was originally intended, the Great Plaza surrounding the Oscar S.

Chairman that a plan be made to return to Government operation as a park,

The need for parking seemed to outweigh the proposal made by the

to put people now in rented space into them.

bear down these terms," the General Services Administration is obliged

of the Potomac River in place of the Constitution Avenue Bridge which it had formerly approved. The Commission believes that any cost of such a structure over and above the cost of the bridge, if finally approved, should be borne by the Federal Government and that the Commission requests interested agencies and individuals to meet with a committee of Commission members appointed by the Chairman for the purpose of bringing in a recommendation to the Commission."

Mr. Nolen then read to the Commission the report (Exhibit B) brought to his Commission by a committee, mentioned in the above resolution, composed of Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, who served as Chairman of the committee; Mr. Leon Zach, representing the Chief Engineer, Corps of Engineers; Colonel Thomas A. Lane, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia; and Mr. Harold J. Spelman, representing the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads. The National Capital Planning Commission accepted the report and released it to the press.

Mr. Nolen further reported that a staff committee, composed of representatives of the District of Columbia Highway Department, the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Park Service, compiled estimates of respective costs of a bridge and tunnel from Mr. Singstad's drawings. The estimated difference showed the tunnel would cost some twenty-six million dollars more than the bridge.

Subsequently, the Planning Commission reported to the Bureau of the Budget on proposed legislation prepared by the Secretary of the Interior which "put into effect the President's recommendations, requested last summer," and "authorized the (District) Commissioners to construct a tunnel in lieu of a bridge."

nel in lieu of a bridge."

summer," and "authorized the (District) Commissioners to construct a tun- which "put into effect the President's recommendations, requested that Budget on proposed legislation prepared by the Secretary of the Interior

Subsequently, the Planning Commission reported to the Bureau of the twenty-six million dollars more than the bridge.

drawings. The estimated difference showed the tunnel would cost some means of respective costs of a bridge and tunnel from Mr. Bingsted's Capital Planning Commission and the National Park Service, compiled esti- representatives of the District of Columbia Highway Department, the National

Mr. Nolen further reported that a staff committee, composed of rep- Commission accepted the report and released it to the press.

Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads. The National Capital Planning of the District of Columbia; and Mr. Harold L. Spelman, representing the Engineer, Corps of Engineers; Colonel Thomas A. Lane, Engineer Commissioner as Chairman of the committee; Mr. Leon Zach, representing the Chief posed of Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, who served to his Commission by a committee, mentioned in the above resolution, com-

Mr. Nolen then read to the Commission the report (Exhibit B) brought mendation to the Commission."

members appointed by the Chairman for the purpose of bringing in a recom- interested agencies and individuals to meet with a committee of Commission should be borne by the Federal Government and that the Commission requests structure over and above the cost of the bridge, if finally approved, had formerly approved. The Commission believes that any cost of such a

or the Potomac River in place of the Constitution Avenue Bridge which it

The original proposal by Senator Case was for a bridge on the line of New Hampshire Avenue, to which the Fine Arts Commission was on record as objecting. The switch to the Constitution Avenue approach was made without consultation with this Commission. This, too, is opposed by the Fine Arts Commission. Concerning a bridge span, Chairman Finley stated, "Our position is consistent. We opposed a high level bridge coming over Roosevelt Island which would have been visible from the Lincoln Memorial and would have cut off the view of the Lincoln Memorial looking downstream. We thought the Government had some moral obligation to keep its word to the trustees of the Roosevelt Island, so we opposed it on two grounds. Unless the Roosevelt Island trustees gave their permission for a crossing at E Street, we did not see how the Government could do it. We could not advocate it but if they had given permission for a low-level bridge crossing at E Street, I think the Commission would have approved it."

Under date of 31 March 1955, a letter was received from Mr. Roger W. Jones, Assistant Director, Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, requesting the views of the Commission with respect to a draft of a bill (Exhibit C) to amend the Act of August 30, 1954 "To authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes." A draft of the Commission's report was read by the Chairman, who asked for its acceptance. Approval of the report, drafted by Mr. Wilson and Chairman Finley, was seconded by Mr. Harrison and was carried by a unanimous vote.

It was recalled that the Commission has held a consistent view with regard to all proposed bridges in the proximity of the Memorial Bridge and

The original proposal by Senator Cose was for a bridge on the line of New Hampshire Avenue, to which the Fine Arts Commission was on record as objecting. The switch to the Constitution Avenue approach was made without consultation with this Commission. This, too, is opposed by the Fine Arts Commission. Concerning a bridge span, Chairman Finley stated, "Our position is consistent. We opposed a high level bridge coming over Roosevelt Island which would have been visible from the Lincoln Memorial and would have cut off the view of the Lincoln Memorial looking downstream. We thought the Government had some moral obligation to keep its word to the trustees of the Roosevelt Island, so we opposed it on two grounds. Unless the Roosevelt Island trustees gave their permission for a crossing at K Street, we did not see how the Government could do it. We could not advocate it but if they had given permission for a low-level bridge crossing at K Street, I think the Commission would have approved it."

Under date of 31 March 1955, a letter was received from Mr. Roger W. Jones, Assistant Director, Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, requesting the views of the Commission with respect to a draft of a bill (Exhibit C) to amend the Act of August 30, 1954 "To authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes." A draft of the Commission's report was read by the Chairman, who stated for its acceptance. Approval of the report, drafted by Mr. Wilson and Chairman Finley, was seconded by Mr. Harrison and was carried by a unanimous vote.

It was recalled that the Commission has held a consistent view with regard to all proposed bridges in the proximity of the Memorial Bridge and

Roosevelt Island. It is opposed to any bridge and only approves a tunnel if a crossing must be made at this point. The report was sent accordingly (Exhibit C-1).

7. DETENTION HOUSE, WOMAN'S BUREAU, POLICE DEPARTMENT: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, District Supervising Architect presented to the Commission revised plans for a three-story brick building for the Detention House, Woman's Bureau, Metropolitan Police Department, which is to be erected on North Capitol Street, between K and L Streets, Northwest. The plans were explained by the architect, Mr. A. Hamilton Wilson, of the architectural firm of Wilson and Denton of Washington, D. C. The Secretary mentioned that the Commission of Fine Arts had approved a previous design in May, 1952, which called for the use of stone.

It was decided to consider the project further and report to Mr. Coe by letter. This was done (Exhibit D).

8. WOODBRIDGE BRANCH PUBLIC LIBRARY: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, District Supervising Architect, accompanied by Mr. Leon Chatelain, architect, presented to the Commission revised plans for the Woodbridge Branch Public Library for further consideration, as requested by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting on 23 March 1955 with Mr. Coe and Mr. Chatelain, and Mr. Wilson representing the Commission.

Mr. Coe explained that the Chief Librarian, Public Libraries, Mr. Harry N. Peterson, objected to the effect that the Commission's suggested changes in the facade would have on the efficiency of control and operation of the library space. The Commission then recommended changes in the side elevation and the first and second floor definition. They also suggested that the elimination of the penthouse, housing the elevator shaft,

Roosevelt Island. It is opposed to any bridge and only approves a tunnel if a crossing must be made at this point. The report was sent accordingly (Exhibit C-1).

7. DETENTION HOUSE, WOMAN'S SECTION, POLICE DEPARTMENT: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, District Supervising Architect presented to the Commission revised plans for a three-story brick building for the Detention House, Woman's Bureau, Metropolitan Police Department, which is to be erected on North Capitol Street, between K and L Streets, Northwest. The plans were explained by the architect, Mr. A. Hamilton Wilson, of the architectural firm of Wilson and Benton of Washington, D. C. The Secretary mentioned that the Commission of Fine Arts had approved a previous design in May, 1932, which called for the use of stone.

It was decided to consider the project further and report to Mr. Coe by letter. This was done (Exhibit D).

8. WOODRIDGE BRANCH PUBLIC LIBRARY: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, District Supervising Architect, accompanied by Mr. Leon Chatelain, architect, presented to the Commission revised plans for the Woodridge Branch Public Library for further consideration, as requested by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting on 23 March 1933 with Mr. Coe and Mr. Chatelain, and Mr. Wilson representing the Commission.

Mr. Coe explained that the Chief Librarian, Public Libraries, Mr. Harry N. Peterson, objected to the effect that the Commission's suggested changes in the facade would have on the efficiency of control and operation of the library space. The Commission then recommended changes in the side elevation and the first and second floor definition. They also suggested that the elimination of the pentHouse, housing the elevator shaft,

would improve appearances a great deal. With the modifications suggested, Mr. Coe was to proceed with working drawings. A report was sent accordingly (Exhibit E).

9. AUDITORIUM OF FINE ARTS, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: A perspective model, an elevation and the preliminary plans for a proposed Auditorium of Fine Arts at Howard University were presented to the Commission by Mr. L. L. Hunter, Supervising Architect; Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; and Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson, architect, accompanied by Mr. Julian A. Cook, Coordinator of Buildings Program, Howard University. The details of the Fine Arts group, consisting of an auditorium, a small theatre and a classroom wing, were discussed. The Commission approved the project, expressing the hope that the architect would incorporate the worthwhile suggestions, offered by Mr. Harrison, that the ends of the small theatre be rounded to give more character to the mass and to arrive at a more spacious impression.

10. LIBRARY BUILDING, GALLAUDET COLLEGE: Mr. L. L. Hunter, Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, accompanied by Mr. William N. Denton, Jr., architect of the firm of Wilson and Denton of Washington, D. C., presented tentative plans for a proposed library building at Gallaudet College, at Seventh Street and Florida Avenue, Northeast. It is to be a two-story building with basement. The material will be brick with stone trim. Since the plans were preliminary, the Commission approved them in general. A formal report of approval was not sent.

The morning session was recessed at 12:15 p. m. The members attended an American Institute of Architects luncheon at the Octagon. The Commission reconvened at 2:00 p. m., in Room 7000 Interior Building.

The morning session was recessed at 12:15 p. m. The members attended an American Institute of Architects luncheon at the Octagon. The Commission reconvened at 2:00 p. m., in Room 7000 Interior Building.

7. AUDITORIUM OF FINE ARTS, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: A perspective model, an elevation and the preliminary plans for a proposed Auditorium of Fine Arts at Howard University were presented to the Commission by Mr. L. B. Hunter, Supervising Architect; Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; and Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson, architect, accompanied by Mr. Julian A. Cook, Coordinator of Buildings Program, Howard University. The details of the Fine Arts group, consisting of an auditorium, a small theatre and a classroom wing, were discussed. The Commission approved the project, expressing the hope that the architect would incorporate the worthwhile suggestions, offered by Mr. Harrison, that the ends of the small theatre be rounded to give more character to the mass and to arrive at a more spacious impression.

10. LIBRARY BUILDING, GALLAUDET COLLEGE: Mr. L. E. Hunter, Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, accompanied by Mr. William M. Denton, Jr., architect of the firm of Wilson and Denton of Washington, D. C., presented tentative plans for a proposed library building at Gallaudet College, at Seventh Street and Florida Avenue, Northeast. It is to be a two-story building with basement. The material will be brick with stone trim. Since the plans were preliminary, the Commission approved them in general. A formal report of approval was not asked.

11. WHITE HOUSE - PLANS TO ENLARGE EXECUTIVE OFFICE: Mr. G. B. Allen and Mr. P. F. Annable, members of the management consulting firm of Robert Heller and Associates, of Cleveland, and Mr. Stephen Benedict, Assistant Staff Secretary, the White House, were introduced by Chairman Finley. They requested the advice of the Commission in regard to a preliminary study which they made of the White House for getting better space requirements for the offices of the President, for future expansion of the Executive Offices of the President. They were retained by the White House primarily to assist in determining what the general character and size of the Executive Offices of the President will be for possibly the next twenty years.

As a preliminary to deciding how that organization should and can be housed, Mr. Allen explained that this work was brought about as a culmination of the dissatisfaction of many people with the Executive Offices of the President, which are located in the west wing of the White House and in the Executive Office Building. The offices are neither large enough, grouped together adequately, or fitting in any respect for the Chief Executive of the United States.

In addition to determining what the organizational structure and the number and types of people are going to be in the future, his job, Mr. Allen continued, would be to determine the type and size of space required, and to consider several alternative methods of housing the organization. Finally, to recommend a course of action which might include certain broad specifications as to size, location, and the utilization of space.

On a short range plan to provide adequate space for the immediate White House staff, housed in the west wing of the White House and partially in the Executive Office Building, it was reported by Messrs. Allen and

11. WHITE HOUSE - PLANS TO ENLARGE EXECUTIVE OFFICE: Mr. G. E. Allen and Mr. P. F. Annable, members of the management consulting firm of Robert Heller and Associates, of Cleveland, and Mr. Stephen Benedict, Assistant Staff Secretary, the White House, were introduced by Chairman Finley. They requested the advice of the Commission in regard to a preliminary study which they made of the White House for getting better space requirements for the offices of the President, for future expansion of the Executive Offices of the President. They were retained by the White House primarily to assist in determining what the general character and size of the Executive Offices of the President will be for possibly the next twenty years.

As a preliminary to deciding how that organization should and can be housed, Mr. Allen explained that this work was brought about as a culmination of the dissatisfaction of many people with the Executive Offices of the President, which are located in the west wing of the White House and in the Executive Office Building. The offices are neither large enough grouped together adequately, or fitting in any respect for the Chief Executive of the United States.

In addition to determining what the organizational structure and the number and types of people are going to be in the future, like job, Mr. Allen continued, would be to determine the type and size of space required, and to consider several alternative methods of housing the organization. Finally, to recommend a course of action which might include certain broad specifications as to size, location, and the utilization of space.

On a short range plan to provide adequate space for the immediate White House staff, housed in the west wing of the White House and partially in the Executive Office Building, it was reported by Messrs. Allen and

Annable that work had been initiated according to their firm's recommendations as to minimum requirements for better utilization of the space in the west wing.

In reporting on their long-range phase, Mr. Allen stated they were at the point where they wished to consider the "aesthetic, historical, psychological" aspects of the problem. Five alternative plans were offered to the Commission of Fine Arts for their comments and advice (Exhibit F).

Mr. Allen agreed with the Commission that the most feasible plan to follow would be plan five, to replace the Executive Office Building with a new structure, which would be designed in harmony with the surrounding buildings.

The Commission expressed an opinion as to what it feels is the most adequate solution to the problem. The members concurred in Mr. Harrison's summation of the points which the Commission wished to recommend, namely, (1) to get all the offices out of the White House, (2) to have a new building constructed where the Executive Office Building is, (3) to construct a new building adjacent to the Blair House to house the Executive Office Building's staff while that building was being replaced. This last recommendation agreed with plan five of the Heller firm representatives.

A discussion of personnel capacity for a new Executive Office Building and the possibility that Congress might not readily agree to a proposal for two new buildings ensued, followed by an exchange of ideas as to the utilization of the remaining east and west wings of the White House.

The Chairman expressed the hope that the Commission can be of further assistance to the White House and to Messrs. Allen and Annable in arriving at a satisfactory solution to the problem.

assistance to the White House and to Messrs. Allen and Bunkle in arriving at a satisfactory solution to the problem.

The Chairman expressed the hope that the Commission can be of further assistance to the White House and to Messrs. Allen and Bunkle in arriving at a satisfactory solution to the problem.

12. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: The following applications were submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for action:

S. L. 1738 - Alterations and revisions to 119 D St., NE. Submitted 4 April 1955. Approved 13 April 1955.

S. L. 1739 - Remodel show front of Bassin's Restaurant at 1347 E St., NW. Submitted 11 April 1955. The Commission suggested the use of limestone or limestone color. No action was taken.

S. L. 1740 - Remodel store front at 623-25 15th St., NW. Submitted 11 April 1955. Approved 13 April 1955.

S. L. 1741 - New dwelling at 7030 Oregon Ave., NW. Submitted 11 April 1955. Approved 13 April 1955.

S. L. 1749 - Revised design of illuminated sign to be erected at 719-15th St., NW (National Savings and Trust Company) was presented by Mr. J. Franklin Groff of Kass-Berger Realty Co., as requested by the Commission at the March meeting. The Commission approved the design and the case was submitted formally on 22 April 1955. Approved 27 April 1955.

13. WASHINGTON MONUMENT, LIGHTING OF: Advice for improving the lighting of the Washington Monument was sought of the Fine Arts Commission by Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent, National Capital Parks, and Mr. Robert C. Horne, also of that office. They referred the Commission to a recent picture of the Washington Monument showing the inadequate, spotty lighting. Both Westinghouse and General Electric had offered solutions to the problem which were not satisfactory to the National Capital Park's authorities. Mr. Thompson enumerated the changes his office would like to incorporate in the illuminating of the Monument. They wished to light it "from the complete base to the complete top," with constant gradation. The greatest intensity would be at the bottom, with a tapering off of the light toward the top. They want something that would be adjustable in candlelight power, gradually increasing to four times that of the present. It is proposed to mount the lights on hydraulic ramps that

12. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: The following applications were submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for action:

S. I. 1738 - Alterations and revisions to 1119 D St., NE. Submitted 4 April 1955. Approved 13 April 1955.

S. I. 1739 - Remodel show front of Bassin's Restaurant at 1341 F St., NW. Submitted 11 April 1955. The Commission suggested the use of limestone or limestone color. No action was taken.

S. I. 1740 - Remodel store front at 629-25 15th St., NW. Submitted 11 April 1955. Approved 13 April 1955.

S. I. 1741 - New dwelling at 7030 Oregon Ave., NW. Submitted 11 April 1955. Approved 13 April 1955.

S. I. 1742 - Revised design of illuminated sign to be erected at 712-15th St., NW (National Savings and Trust Company) was presented by Mr. G. Franklin Croff of Kess-Berger Realty Co., as requested by the Commission at the March meeting. The Commission approved the design and the case was submitted formally on 22 April 1955. Approved 27 April 1955.

13. WASHINGTON MONUMENT, LIGHTING OF: Advice for improving the lighting of the Washington Monument was sought of the Fine Arts Commission by Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent, National Capital Parks, and Mr. Robert C. Horne, also of that office. They referred the Commission to a recent picture of the Washington Monument showing the inadequate, spotty lighting. Both Westinghouse and General Electric had offered solutions to the problem which were not satisfactory to the National Capital Park's authorities. Mr. Thompson enumerated the changes his office would like to incorporate in the illuminating of the Monument. They wished to light it "from the complete base to the complete top," with constant gradation. The greatest intensity would be at the bottom, with a tapering off of the light toward the top. They want something that would be adjustable in candlelight power, gradually increasing to four times that of the present. It is proposed to mount the lights on hydraulic ramps that

would be ground level in daytime and brought up at night to above eye level so they would not interfere with people walking or driving. The Commission voted to approve these suggestions made by Mr. Thompson.

14. AMERICAN MILITARY CEMETERY AT HAMM, LUXEMBOURG: Chairman Finley read to the Commission the following letter dated 11 April 1955, received from Mr. John Harbeson, of the architectural firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson:

"Dear Mr. Finley:

> On behalf of the architect for the memorial at Hamm, Luxembourg, Francis Keally, I submit for consideration of your Commission the names of Leo Friedlander (New York) and Walker Hancock (Folly Cove, Mass.) as sculptors, and of Allyn Cox (New York) as painter (for design of mosaic ceiling in the Chapel and of the battle maps on two stelae). These artists have the approval of the Battle Monuments Commission. I send the names with my hearty endorsement."

The members decided to defer their decision until the next meeting of the Commission. There was agreement to Mr. Finley's suggestion that he write to the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, Brigadier General Thomas North, requesting him to bring to the next meeting of the Fine Arts Commission, Mr. Keally's designs for the memorial building and his plans for the sculptural and mural decorations of the Chapel. Reviewing these, it was felt, would guide the Commission in considering the names submitted.

15. LEGISLATION:

H. R. 4534 and S. 1413 - 84th Congress, bills "To amend the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts." (See Item 3, page 2 of these minutes.)

H. R. 2968 and H. R. 3110 - 84th Congress, bills "To establish a Commission to prepare a plan for the removal of temporary Government buildings in the District of Columbia, for the accommodation in other buildings of the personnel employed in such temporary buildings, and for other purposes."

would be ground level in daytime and brought up at night to above eye level so they would not interfere with people walking or driving. The Commission voted to approve these suggestions made by Mr. Thompson.

14. AMERICAN MILITARY CEMETERY AT HAMM, LUXEMBOURG: Chairman Finley read to the Commission the following letter dated 11 April 1955, received from Mr. John Harbeson, of the architectural firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson:

"Dear Mr. Finley:

> On behalf of the architect for the memorial at Hamm, Luxembourg, Francis Keally, I submit for consideration of your Commission the names of Leo Friedlander (New York) and Walker Hancock (Polly Cove, Mass.) as sculptors, and of Allyn Cox (New York) as painter (for design of mosaic ceiling in the Chapel and of the battle map on two stelae). These artists have the approval of the Battle Monuments Commission. I send the names with my hearty endorsement."

The members decided to defer their decision until the next meeting of the Commission. There was agreement to Mr. Finley's suggestion that he write to the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, Brigadier General Thomas North, requesting him to bring to the next meeting of the Fine Arts Commission, Mr. Keally's designs for the memorial building and his plans for the sculptural and mural decorations of the Chapel. Before viewing these, it was felt, would guide the Commission in considering the names submitted.

15. LEGISLATION:

H. R. 4534 and S. 1413 - 84th Congress, bills "To amend the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts." (See Item 3, page 2 of these minutes.)

H. R. 2956 and H. R. 3110 - 84th Congress, bills "To establish a Commission to prepare a plan for the removal of temporary Government buildings in the District of Columbia, for the accommodation in other buildings of the personnel employed in such temporary buildings, and for other purposes."

Under date of 1 April 1955, a letter was received from the Chairman of the House Committee on Public Works requesting the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on the above identical bills.

The members discussed the provisions of the bills and unanimously endorsed the establishment of the proposed Commission. Accordingly, a report of approval was sent to the House Committee on Public Works (Exhibit G).

H. R. 4687 - 84th Congress, a bill "To authorize the Administrator of General Services to dispose of certain real property in the District of Columbia."

A letter, dated 1 April 1955, was received from Mr. L. M. Leisenring, Chairman, Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings, American Institute of Architects, in which it was requested that the Commission of Fine Arts oppose the razing of the Old Patent Office Building, as proposed in H. R. 4687 and 4841-84th Congress (Exhibit H).

The Commission discussed the matter and were unanimous that the Old Patent Office Building should not be destroyed. A reply to this effect was sent to Mr. Leisenring (Exhibit H-1).

It was noted that the Commission of Fine Arts had previously reported to Congress on H. R. 4687 (See Item 12, H. R. 4687-84th Congress, in the minutes of 15 March 1955), but have not as yet been asked to report on H. R. 4841-84th Congress.

One other bill was reviewed as pending legislation on which the Commission might possibly be asked to report. The Secretary included this bill as a matter of information. The Chairman asked the members to study the bill for consideration at the next meeting of the Commission. The title of the bill follows:

Under date of 1 April 1955, a letter was received from the Chairman of the House Committee on Public Works requesting the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on the above identical bills.

The members discussed the provisions of the bills and unanimously endorsed the establishment of the proposed Commission. Accordingly, a report of approval was sent to the House Committee on Public Works (Exhibit G).

H. R. 4687 - 84th Congress, a bill "To authorize the Administrator of General Services to dispose of certain real property in the District of Columbia."

A letter, dated 1 April 1955, was received from Mr. L. M. Leisenring, Chairman, Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings, American Institute of Architects, in which it was requested that the Commission of Fine Arts oppose the razing of the Old Patent Office Building, as proposed in H. R. 4687 and 4841-84th Congress (Exhibit H).

The Commission discussed the matter and were unanimous that the Old Patent Office Building should not be destroyed. A reply to this effect was sent to Mr. Leisenring (Exhibit H-1).

It was noted that the Commission of Fine Arts had previously reported to Congress on H. R. 4687 (See Item 12, H. R. 4687-83th Congress, in the minutes of 15 March 1955), but have not as yet been asked to report on H. R. 4841-84th Congress.

One other bill was reviewed as pending legislation on which the Commission might possibly be asked to report. The Secretary included this bill as a matter of information. The Chairman asked the members to study the bill for consideration at the next meeting of the Commission. The title of the bill follows:

H. R. 4913 - 84th Congress, a bill "To provide for the establishment of the National Arts Agency."

16. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STAMPS: Under date of 8 April 1955, a letter was received from Mr. Ernest Fiene, Corresponding Secretary, National Academy of Design, regarding the advisory committee on stamps (Exhibit I). The letter stated in part "It was agreed that Messrs. Norman Kent, Fritz Eichenberg and Anthony de Francisci would serve with the Commission of Fine Arts as an advisory committee on stamps." The Chairman pointed out that this statement was incorrect, since the advisory committee would not serve as consultants with the Commission of Fine Arts, but would serve as consultants to the Post Office Department, and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The Commission of Fine Arts only maintains supervisory control over arrangements for bringing together the interested parties who will submit the results of their conferences to the Commission for review.

The terms suggested by the Fine Arts Commission, that the advisory committee serve without remuneration other than actual expenses involved, were accepted by the Academy committee. However, they requested that meetings be held on week ends for the convenience of the committee members, or else have the representatives of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing meet with the advisory committee in New York City.

It was decided to get in touch with officials of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and report accordingly to the National Academy of Design (Exhibit I-1).

17. GIFT TO THE UNITED STATES - "LABORING YOUTH," SCULPTURED BY HERMANN BLUMENTHAL: During a discussion of the placement of the statue,

H. R. 4913 - 84th Congress, a bill "To provide for the establishment of the National Arts Agency."

16. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STAMPS: Under date of 8 April 1955, a letter was received from Mr. Ernest Flagg, Corresponding Secretary, National Academy of Design, regarding the advisory committee on stamps (Exhibit I). The letter stated in part "It was agreed that Messrs. Norman Kent, Frida Rosenberg and Anthony de Francisci would serve with the Commission of Fine Arts as an advisory committee on stamps." The Chairman pointed out that this statement was incorrect, since the advisory committee would not serve as consultants with the Commission of Fine Arts, but would serve as consultants to the Post Office Department, and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The Commission of Fine Arts only maintains supervisory control over arrangements for bringing together the interested parties who will submit the results of their conferences to the Commission for review.

The terms suggested by the Fine Arts Commission, that the advisory committee serve without remuneration other than actual expenses involved, were accepted by the Academy committee. However, they requested that meetings be held on week ends for the convenience of the committee members, or else have the representatives of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing meet with the advisory committee in New York City.

It was decided to get in touch with officials of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and report accordingly to the National Academy of Design (Exhibit I-1).

17. CLOT TO THE UNITED STATES - "LABORING YOUTH," SCULPTURED BY HERMANN SCHWEINTHAL: During a discussion of the placement of the statue,

"Laboring Youth," a gift to the United States from the German people, accepted by President Eisenhower for the United States, Chairman Finley asked Mr. Elbert Peets and Mr. Felix de Weldon to bring to the next meeting suggestions for a suitable location for the sculpture.

The Commission adjourned at 4:40 p. m.

"Laboring Youth," a gift to the United States from the German people, accepted by President Eisenhower for the United States, Chairman Finley asked Mr. Hibert Peets and Mr. Felix de Weldon to bring to the next meeting suggestions for a suitable location for the sculpture.

The Commission adjourned at 4:40 p. m.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Honorable Richard M. Nixon
President of the Senate
Washington 25, D. C.

28 February 1955

Dear Mr. President:

Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Act of May 17, 1910, relating to the establishment of a Commission of Fine Arts, and for other purposes."

I respectfully suggest that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend that it be enacted.

The proposed bill would repeal the $10,000 limit of authorization established for the expenditures of the Commission of Fine Arts at the time of its establishment May 17, 1910. Over the succeeding 45 years, the scope of the Commission has been extended by executive orders, and two additional bills have been enacted into law which have increased the mission and responsibilities of the Commission without authorizing additional appropriations. These laws are:

Public Law 231-71st Congress, An act "To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital."

Public Law 808-81st Congress, An act "To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital."

During recent congressional committee hearings on appropriation estimates, note has been taken by the committee chairmen of both houses that no change in the limit of authorization has been made since the enactment of the original legislation and it was suggested that remedial legislation should be initiated by the Commission. The Congress has recognized the Commission's need to exceed the established limit by approving appropriations beyond the authorized limit. The objective of this legislation is to eliminate the disparity between the 1910 limit of authorization and the current operating budget of the Commission.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Enclosure

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

D R A F T

A B I L L

To amend the Act of May 17, 1910, relating to the establishment of a Commission of Fine Arts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 2 of the Act of May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371), which authorized "an expenditure of not exceeding $10,000 a year for the expenses of a permanent Commission of Fine Arts," is hereby repealed. Such annual appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission of Fine Arts are hereby authorized.

DRAFT

A BILL

To amend the Act of May 17, 1910, relating to the establishment of a Commission of Fine Arts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 2 of the Act of May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371), which authorized "an expenditure of not exceeding $10,000 a year for the expenses of a permanent Commission of Fine Arts," is hereby repealed. Such annual appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission of Fine Arts are hereby authorized.

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

April 7, 1955

MEMORANDUM TO: National Capital Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Report on Tunnel at Constitution Avenue

1. This report responds to a directive to this Special Committee to report upon the Tunnel Plan presented orally to the Planning Commission by Mr. Ole Singstad for the Society of Professional Engineers.

2. The staff committee has worked out a suitable plan of approaches for the tunnel on the Constitution Avenue location. This plan will enable the tunnel to function equally well with the authorized bridge at the same general site. The plan is based upon a 6-lane tunnel which will have approximately 90% of the capacity of the 6-lane bridge.

3. The staff committee, which includes representatives of the D. C. Highway Department, has prepared an estimated cost of the tunnel and its approaches at approximately $52,000,000. The approaches to be included in the estimate will cover the same areas and service as those included in the approved bridge plan and estimate. The difference between the bridge and tunnel approach plans are primarily in details in the immediate approaches and are due to the physical differences between a tunnel and a bridge.

4. An estimate of cost of the 6-lane bridge and the approaches as included is $24,500,000.

5. The objections which have been urged to the bridge are based upon aesthetic grounds. Your committee believes that from a general planning and service standpoint, either the bridge or the tunnel will be suitable.

6. The committee has not attempted to pass upon the question as to whether the aesthetic advantages of a tunnel over the bridge are worth the large increase in cost involved.

/s/ Leon Zach
Leon Zach

/s/ Conrad L. Wirth
Conrad L. Wirth, Chairman

/s/ T. A. Lane
Colonel T. A. Lane

/s/ Harold J. Spelman
Harold J. Spelman

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

A B I L L

To amend the Act of August 30, 1954 "To authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title I of the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 961) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I - TUNNEL IN VICINITY OF CONSTITUTION AVENUE

That (a) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate a tunnel across the Potomac River, from the vicinity of Constitution Avenue in the District of Columbia to the Virginia side of the Potomac River, such tunnel to be constructed north of the Memorial Bridge and south of, or under, Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Island, together with approaches and roads connecting such tunnel and approach ramps with streets and park roads in the District of Columbia and with streets and park roads on the Virginia side of the Potomac River: Provided, That in planning such approach ramps and connecting roads, the Commissioners shall consult with the National Capital Planning Commission: Provided further, That the plans for the tunnel, approach ramps, interchanges, connecting roads, and related works shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The tunnel, approach ramps, interchanges, and connecting roads at both ends of the tunnel shall be constructed with a view to retaining so far as possible the monumental setting and the artistic design of the Lincoln Memorial, the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and other monumental structures, properties, and park lands in the general area.

EXHIBIT C

To amend the Act of August 30, 1954 "To authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title I of the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 401) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I - TUNNEL IN VICINITY OF GEORGETOWN AVENUE

That (a) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate a tunnel across the Potomac River, from the vicinity of Constitution Avenue in the District of Columbia to the Virginia side of the Potomac River, such tunnel to be constructed north of the Memorial Bridge and south of, or under, Roosevelt Memorial Island, together with approaches and roads connecting such tunnel and approach ramps with streets and park roads in the District of Columbia and with streets and park roads on the Virginia side of the Potomac River: Provided, That in planning such approach ramps and connecting roads, the Commissioners shall consult with the National Capital Planning Commission: Provided further, That the plans for such tunnel, approach ramps, interchanges, connecting roads, and related works shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The tunnel, approach ramps, interchanges, and connecting roads in each side of the tunnel shall be constructed with a view to maintaining as far as possible the monumental setting and the artistic design of the Lincoln Memorial, the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and other monumental structures, properties, and park lands in the general area.

EXHIBIT C

(b) The plans for the tunnel or other structures authorized by this title shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for approval with respect to the architectural features thereof, and no contract for the construction thereof may be entered into until such approval has been secured: Provided, That upon failure of the Commission of Fine Arts to report its approval or disapproval within ninety days of submission of plans to it, the requirements of this subsection shall be deemed to have been met.

(c) Appropriations for construction of the tunnel and other structures authorized by this title, payable from the highway fund of the District of Columbia, in amounts not exceeding $24,500,000 are hereby authorized. Any additional cost shall be borne by the Federal Government and appropriations thereof, not to exceed $28,000,000 are hereby authorized.

SEC. 102. Land and facilities under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or under the jurisdiction of other Federal agencies, may be used for the tunnel, the approach ramps, related structures, and connecting roads in accordance with plans to be formulated and approved in accordance with this Act. The closing, obliteration, construction, or relocation of facilities including roads as a result of the use of the aforesaid Federal land for purposes of this Act shall be accomplished in accordance with plans and procedures satisfactory to the head of the department having administrative jurisdiction over such properties. Land and facilities including roads in the vicinity of both ends of the tunnel shall continue to be under the administrative jurisdiction and control of the department or agency having jurisdiction over

such properties prior to construction of the said tunnel and appurtenant structures: Provided, That the tunnel and approach ramps shall remain under the administrative jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 103. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into an agreement or agreements with the State Highway Commission of Virginia, acting for and on behalf of the Commonwealth of Virginia, for the purpose of providing for cooperation by the State Highway Commission of Virginia, to such extent as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall deem necessary, in the construction of said tunnel, approach ramps, connecting roads, acquisition of land for rights-of-way, contributions toward costs, temporary or permanent closing of existing roads, and any other matters relating to the construction of said tunnel which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may consider appropriate.

SEC. 104. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to make such use of federally owned and controlled lands at and adjacent to the tunnel as may be necessary for making borings, performing other preliminary work, routing and re-routing traffic, constructing said tunnel, approach ramps, and connecting roads, and storing of materials incident to such preliminary work and to actual construction with the approval of the Federal agency having jurisdiction of the lands involved.

SEC. 105. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed, in accordance with plans to be approved as prescribed by this Act, to route and re-route and to cause the routing and re-routing

of traffic on, and to close or cause to be closed park roads, streets, and highways under the jurisdiction of the United States, by agreement with the Secretary of the Interior, and to negotiate for the closing of roads by agreement with Virginia authorities, where necessary in connection with the preparation of plans for, and during the actual construction of, said tunnel, approach ramps, and connecting roads. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are further authorized to prepare plans for such changes in park roads as they deem necessary to provide maximum efficiency in handling traffic to and from said tunnel, and when such plans are approved by the Bureau of Public Roads and by the Secretary of the Interior, to construct roads in conformity with such approved plans.

SEC. 106 (a) Prior to the beginning of construction, and upon notification by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that such construction is imminent, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to remove or transplant to other locations any and all planting materials within the area to be used for the tunnel, approach ramps, and connecting roads or for construction purposes. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to regrade the areas involved in the construction of the tunnel, approach ramps, and connecting roads so as to conform with the plans to be approved as provided in this Act.

(b) Upon completion of said tunnel, approach ramps, connecting roads, and the regrading of the areas, or prior thereto when authorized by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and when such operation or operations will not interfere with the construction of said tunnel, approach ramps, and connecting roads, the Secretary of the Interior is

directed to landscape such areas in accordance with the plans to be approved in accordance with this Act, the cost of said landscaping to be paid out of funds allotted and made available for the purposes of this title.

SEC. 107. The cost of construction, reconstruction, relocations, obliteration, and repair of all facilities and related works, including roads, which are changed or made necessary as an incident to the construction of said tunnel, approach ramps, and connecting roads, in accordance with plans to be approved as prescribed by this Act shall be paid out of funds allotted and made available for construction of said tunnel, approach ramps, and connecting roads.

SEC. 108. It is the intent of Title I of this Act that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be responsible for the construction of the tunnel, and its appurtenances, from portal to portal and that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall agree upon the division of all other work to be performed on the basis of the respective jurisdiction and interests of the Federal and District Governments. Such funds as are appropriated shall be allocated on the basis of such division of work."

SEC. 2. That Section 201 of Title II - BRIDGE IN VICINITY OF JONES POINT - is hereby amended to read as follows: "Sec. 201 (a) the Secretary of Commerce (referred to hereinafter as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate a six-lane bridge over the Potomac River, from a point at or near Jones Point, Virginia, across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland,

together with bridge approaches on property owned by the United States in the States of Maryland and Virginia.

(b) The bridge shall be of deck girder construction with a movable span of the double leaf bascule type over the navigable channel, having a minimum horizontal clearance of 150 feet and a 40-foot minimum vertical clearance above mean low water, and shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of Section 502 of the "General Bridge Act of 1946," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 847), as amended, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this title.

(c) The Secretary shall request the recommendations and suggestions of the National Capital Planning Commission relative to the design of such bridge and approaches and shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior with respect to all plans for overpasses, approaches, interchanges, and connecting roads at both ends of the bridge which affect lands and facilities administered or authorized to be administered by the Department of the Interior.

(d) That upon the completion of the bridge project all lands acquired pursuant to this Act that are located within the authorized boundaries of the George Washington Memorial Parkway shall be under the administrative control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the Parkway, with the exception that such portions thereof that shall be actually occupied by the bridge structure and main approaches leading thereto, and the bridge itself, shall be under the administrative control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce."

SEC. 3. That the title to the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 961) is amended to read as follows: "To authorize and direct the construction

COPY

of a tunnel in the vicinity of Constitution Avenue, and a bridge in the vicinity of Jones Point, under and over the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

COPY

Mr. Roger W. Jones
Assistant Director
Legislative Reference
Bureau of the Budget
Washington 25, D. C.

13 April 1955

Dear Mr. Jones:

I have your letter of March 31, 1955, requesting the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on the draft of a bill to amend the Act of August 30, 1954, "To authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River and for other purposes."

The Commission of Fine Arts has long hoped that a solution could be found for Washington's traffic problems that would not require another river crossing in the central area near the Lincoln Memorial and Theodore Roosevelt Island. The Commission of Fine Arts did not endorse Title I of the Act of August 30, 1954 which authorized the construction of a bridge in the vicinity of Constitution Avenue, when this legislation was enacted into law. In their opinion such a bridge would have destructive and irreparable effects on the monumental relationships that have been so carefully built up over a long period of time in the Lincoln Memorial area. In signing the bill authorizing the construction of this bridge, the President expressed his concern over the aesthetic impact of the projected bridge on the Lincoln Memorial, Theodore Roosevelt Island and the other memorials in this area. The Commission has consistently maintained its position in opposing a bridge at this location, and as recently as March 16, 1955 addressed the President, in part, as follows:

> "The present members of the Commission, as do their predecessors, feel that a bridge at the location proposed would seriously mar the beauty of these memorials, which constitute such an important part of the heritage of the American people. The Commission strongly urge that a tunnel be built if no other site for a bridge is available, and have asked me to forward their recommendations to you. This action reaffirms the position previously taken by the Commission of Fine Arts in their recommendations to the Congress and to you as set forth in my letter of February 16, 1955.
>
> "The Commission hopes that you may be willing to recommend to the Congress that existing legislation (Public Law 704-83rd Congress) be amended to provide for the construction of a tunnel instead of a bridge in the vicinity of the Lincoln Memorial and Theodore Roosevelt Island."

EXHIBIT C-1

COPY

Mr. Roger W. Jones
Assistant Director
Legislative Reference
Bureau of the Budget
Washington 25, D. C.

13 April 1955

Dear Mr. Jones:

I have your letter of March 31, 1955, requesting the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on the draft of a bill to amend the Act of August 30, 1954, "To authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River and for other purposes."

The Commission of Fine Arts has long hoped that a solution could be found for Washington's traffic problems that would not require another river crossing in the central area near the Lincoln Memorial and Theodore Roosevelt Island. The Commission of Fine Arts did not endorse Title I of the Act of August 30, 1954 which authorized the construction of a bridge in the vicinity of Constitution Avenue, when this legislation was enacted into law. In their opinion such a bridge would have destructive and irreparable effects on the monumental relationships that have been so carefully built up over a long period of time in the Lincoln Memorial area. In signing the bill authorizing the construction of this bridge, the President expressed his concern over the aesthetic impact of the projected bridge on the Lincoln Memorial, Theodore Roosevelt Island and the other memorials in this area. The Commission has consistently maintained its position in opposing a bridge at this location, and as recently as March 16, 1955 addressed the President, in part, as follows:

> "The present members of the Commission, as do their predecessors, feel that a bridge at the location proposed would seriously mar the beauty of these memorials, which constitute such an important part of the heritage of the American people. The Commission strongly urge that a tunnel be built if no other site for a bridge is available, and have asked me to forward their recommendations to you. This action reaffirms the position previously taken by the Commission of Fine Arts in their recommendations to the Congress and to you as set forth in my letter of February 16, 1955.
>
> "The Commission hopes that you may be willing to recommend to the Congress that existing legislation (Public Law 704--83rd Congress) be amended to provide for the construction of a tunnel instead of a bridge in the vicinity of the Lincoln Memorial and Theodore Roosevelt Island."

EXHIBIT C-1

COPY

Mr. Roger W. Jones 13 April 1955

The Commission is therefore gratified to see that steps to amend the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 961) have been taken. At a meeting held on April 13, 1955, the members considered the draft of the amending legislation and, after careful study, unanimously agreed to endorse the substitution of the tunnel for the bridge as provided in the proposed legislation and have asked me to advise you of our views on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

COPY

Mr. Roger W. Jones 13 April 1955

The Commission is therefore gratified to see that steps to amend the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 951) have been taken. At a meeting held on April 13, 1955, the members considered the draft of the amending legislation and, after careful study, unanimously agreed to endorse the substitution of the tunnel for the bridge as provided in the proposed legislation and have asked me to advise you of our views on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

18 April 1955

Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Supervising Architect
Office of Design and Engineering
Department of Buildings and Grounds
300 Indiana Avenue, N. W.
Washington 1, D. C.

Dear Mr. Coe:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts appreciated having you and the architect, Mr. A. Hamilton Wilson, present for consideration the design of the proposed Woman's Bureau, Metropolitan Police Department, at the meeting of the Commission on 13 April 1955.

After careful study of the design of the facade, the members agreed that the architectural treatment of the building should be simplified. They felt this simplification could be accomplished by eliminating the horizontal band framing the windows, and they suggest that a frank expression of the fenestration and entrance detail be tried. They hope the architcet will be able to restudy the facade and resubmit if for consideration at the next meeting on 5 May 1955.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT D

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

13 April 1955

Mr. Morrel A. Coe, Supervising Architect
Office of Design and Engineering
Department of Buildings and Grounds
300 Indiana Avenue, N. W.
Washington 1, D. C.

Dear Mr. Coe:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts appreciated having you and the architect, Mr. A. Hamilton Wilson, present for consideration the design of the proposed Woman's Bureau, Metropolitan Police Department, at the meeting of the Commission on 13 April 1955.

After careful study of the design of the facade, the members agreed that the architectural treatment of the building should be simplified. They felt this simplification could be accomplished by eliminating the horizontal band framing the windows, and they suggest that a frank expression of the fenestration and entrance detail be tried. They hope the architect will be able to restudy the facade and resubmit it for consideration at the next meeting on 5 May 1955.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT D

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

19 April 1955

Mr. Merrel A. Coe
Supervising Architect
Dept. of Buildings and Grounds
300 Indiana Avenue, N. W.
Washington 1, D. C.

Dear Mr. Coe:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts appreciated having you and Mr. Chatelain return to discuss the design of the Woodridge Branch Public Library, which had been considered at the meeting on 15 March 1955, and which had been returned to you with the Commission's comments by the Secretary on 23 March 1955.

The Commission regrets that the District of Columbia Library authorities have not considered it practicable to alter the operating plan sufficiently to permit the changes in the facade that were considered desirable to give the mass of the building more architectural interest. It is hoped that a simplification in the design of the window treatment on the rear and Eighteenth Street facades, as suggested by Mr. Chatelain, will prove feasible. The members of the Commission realize the limitations imposed on the designer by operating and financial limitations, but they are unanimous that special effort should be made to make small public buildings of this type as attractive in mass and as inviting in detail as it is possible to make them.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT E

EXHIBIT E

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INDIANA AVENUE, NORTHWEST BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

19 April 1955

Mr. Lemuel A. Doe
Supervising Architect
Dept. of Buildings and Grounds
300 Indiana Avenue, N. W.
Washington 1, D. C.

Dear Mr. Doe:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts appreciated having you and Mr. Chetelain return to discuss the design of the Woodridge Branch Public Library, which had been considered at the meeting on 15 March 1955, and which had been returned to you with the Commission's comments by the Secretary on 29 March 1955.

The Commission regrets that the District of Columbia Library authorities have not considered it practicable to alter the operating plan sufficiently to permit the changes in the facade that were considered desirable to give the mass of the building more architectural interest. It is hoped that a simplification in the design of the window treatment on the rear and 14th-seventh Street facades, as suggested by Mr. Chetelain, will prove feasible. The members of the Commission realize the limitations imposed on the designer by operating and financial limitations, but they are unanimous that special effort should be made to make small public buildings of this type as attractive in mass and as inviting in detail as it is possible to make them.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

David E. Finley
Chairman

COPY

Extract of Statement by Mr. G. B. Allen, of the management consulting firm of Robert Heller and Associates, employed by the White House to develop plans for the expansion of the Executive Offices.

"The first possibility, and the simplest, although maybe the least desirable from many standpoints, would be to retain all three of the present structures: the east wing, the west wing, and the Executive Office Building; but with the intention of remodeling the west wing, and the Executive Office building to the extent, or maximum degree required to make full utilization of those structures.

It would mean, probably, a tunnel from the Executive Mansion to the west wing in order to provide underground passage from the east wing to the west wing, which does not now exist. It is now necessary to go through the Mansion or outdoors to get between those two wings.

It would also mean the remodeling of the west wing to the extent of expanding at the ground level, below ground level, to the maximum degree, both north and south, which would mean under the mound to the south and under the driveway to the north, and possibly the addition of a basement in order to get enough space to make it worth while to continue to use the structure.

It would also mean a tunnel from the west wing across West Executive Avenue to Executive Office Building, and, finally, a rather colossal remodeling of the Executive Office Building. On the interior, it would require probably almost a complete new electrical system, including elevators, new heating system, with perhaps major replacements of plumbing. Ideally, a central air conditioning system, a relighting of the building, probably with flourescent fixtures, possibly the lowering of those ceilings which are about 17 feet, and the installation of acoustical ceilings.

Finally, the possibility of filling in the large areas in the courts of those two buildings to provide for additional office space if that is feasible.

And possibly on top of all of that, some exterior remodeling if it is desirable to make that structure conform in exterior appearance with the rest of the buildings, Treasury, White House, and so on.

EXHIBIT F

COPY

EXHIBIT F

Extract of statement by Mr. E. D. Allen, of the management consulting firm of Robert Heller and Associates, employed by the White House to develop plans for the expansion of the Executive Offices.

"The first possibility, and the simplest, although maybe the least desirable from many standpoints, would be to retain all three of the present structures: the east wing, the west wing, and the Executive Office Building; but with the intention of remodeling the west wing, and the Executive Office building to the extent or maximum degree required to make full utilization of those structures.

It would mean, probably, a tunnel from the Executive Mansion to the west wing in order to provide underground passage from the east wing to the west wing, which does not now exist. It is now necessary to go through the Mansion or outdoors to get between those two wings.

It would also mean the remodeling of the west wing to the extent of expanding at the ground level, below ground level, to the maximum degree, both north and south, which would mean under the mound to the south and under the driveway to the north, and possibly the addition of a basement in order to get enough space to make it worth while to continue to use the structure.

It would also mean a tunnel from the west wing across West Executive Avenue to Executive Office Building, finally, a rather colossal remodeling of the Executive Office Building. On the interior, it would require probably almost a complete new electrical system, including elevators, new heating system, with perhaps major replacements of plumbing. Ideally, a central air conditioning system, a relighting of the building, probably with fluorescent fixtures, possibly the lowering of those ceilings which are about 17 feet, and the installation of acoustical ceilings.

Finally, the possibility of filling in the large areas in the courts of those two buildings to provide for additional office space if that is feasible.

And possibly on top of all of that, some exterior remodeling if it is desirable to make that structure conform in exterior and so on.

If that was done, we would be faced, we are quite sure, with rather large expenditures of funds. We do not have those figures together yet. They are being put together for us by the General Services Administration.

We feel sure it would run into many millions of dollars, perhaps ten or twelve, maybe even more. It would mean continued separation of the White House bath because the west wing could not be enlarged sufficiently to accommodate even the present members of the White House Office and it would mean a continuation of limitation with little or no room for expansion in the future.

The second possibility would be to replace the west wing in which the President now has his office with a modern structure leaving the Executive Office Building but remodeling it.

If we did that, we figure we would need a minimum expansion of the west wing to about 150 per cent of its present floor area, in order to accommodate all of the members of the President's immediate staff.

That would mean a rather large underground installation in order to accomplish that, even if it were possible to do so.

We would still be left with an old building, with high maintenance costs, probably, and not much opportunity for future expansion.

The third possibility would be to replace both the west wing and the Executive Office Building with modern structures, retaining the President's office in the west wing.

I will not detail what that might do or might not do. It would continue in effect the present situation generally, although it would provide greatly enlarged office facilities in the present area occupied by the Executive Office Building.

The fourth possibility would be to replace the Executive Office Building with a modern building and to vacate the west wing completely. That would entail removing the President's office from the west wing and providing a modern structure to house the entire Executive Office of the President under one roof.

We don't believe that would indicate the complete demolition of the west wing because it is a balancing structure with the east wing and the east wing is a modern building.

The west wing might be converted into many other uses. It might be left or converted as guest quarters for official visitors or their retinue. It might be made into quest quarters for the President's personal quests or even his family. It might be used

as headquarters for certain services which deal with both the official family and the private family in the Mansion, since there is the Secret Service, White House Police and others.

Going a little farther afield and being somewhat more imaginative, it might be made partially into a recreation center for the White House staff. It might be used, the underground portion of it, as a place for dispatching White House cars, things of that kind, for which there is no room now in that area.

There are undoubtedly other things that could be done.

In fact, we could use that building without imposing upon the dignity of the White House.

The fifth plan that we have discussed is an extension of the fourth which would require two new buildings, a building to replace the present Executive Office building but preceeded by a new building across the street in the site now occupied by the old Court of Claims and in the area behind that, which is now a parking lot, all of that area being currently owned by the Government and largely having been cleared out in anticipation of building there before the Korean War and before World War II, I don't know which. That has certain attractive features as far as the logistics of this problem are concerned.

It would provide temproary housing for the present occupants of the Executive Office building during the reconstruction of that building; and when they were in a position to move back into the new Executive Office building, that building could be used to house some of the occupants of some temporary buildings which would give you an opportunity to eliminate some of those eyesores in Washington.

In addition, another feature which at this time is attractive to us, is that it would provide for expansion of nearby office facilities for the Executive Office of the President in case of war or like emergency.

Obviously, we are not in possession of top secret data with respect to what might be done in case of war, but I think it is reasonable to assume, based on the data we could have, that a full mobilization would rapidly expand the number of people who would have to be housed near the White House or near the White House Offices.

At the present time, that would present a very great problem.

Those are the step by step possibilities. There may be others. There are undoubtedly variations of each of those.

as headquarters for certain services which deal with both the official family and the private family in the Mansion, since there is the Secret Service, White House Police and others.

Going a little farther afield and being somewhat more imaginative, it might be made partially into a recreation center for the White House staff. It might be used, the underground portion of it, as a place for dispatching White House cars, things of that kind, for which there is no room now in that area.

There are undoubtedly other things that could be done.

In fact, we could use that building without imposing upon the dignity of the White House.

The fifth plan that we have discussed is an extension of the fourth which would require two new buildings, a building to replace the present Executive Office building but preceded by a new building across the street in the site now occupied by the old Court of Claims and in the area behind that, which is now a parking lot, all of that area being currently owned by the Government and largely having been cleared out in anticipation of building there before the Korean War and before World War II, I don't know which. That has certain attractive features as far as the logistics of this problem are concerned.

It would provide temporary housing for the present occupants of the Executive Office building during the reconstruction of that building; and when they were in a position to move back into the new Executive Office building, that building could be used to house some of the occupants of some temporary buildings which would give you an opportunity to eliminate some of those eyesores in Washington.

In addition, another feature which at this time is attractive to us, is that it would provide for expansion of nearby office facilities for the Executive Office of the President in case of war or like emergency.

Obviously, we are not in possession of top secret data with respect to what might be done in case of war, but I think it is reasonable to assume, based on the data we could have, that a full mobilization would rapidly expand the number of people who would have to be housed near the White House or near the White House Offices.

At the present time, that would present a very great problem.

Those are the step by step possibilities. There may be others. There are undoubtedly variations of each of those.

We have not reached the point in our study yet where we are ready to say this is the best, but we have at least been giving thought to all of this.

Now, from the standpoint of your Commission, we recognize your interest in the problem and we would be very grateful to get any guidance that you could give us, either now or later, with respect to the problem, particularly to any guidance that would keep us from going down any blind alleys or getting involved in something in which, in the final analysis, would be completely impractical and unsupportable by you people here.

We have very little time for this job. We have to submit our report by the first of June and as a result we have to short-cut as much as we can.

Obviously, our report is not going to immediately generate construction activity. We hope that it will generate some serious thinking and possibly will result in the initiation of some moves toward getting the job done.

Meanwhile, we want our report to be as practical and as useful as possible and that is one of the reasons we are here."

We have not reached the point in our study yet where we are ready to say this is the best, but we have at least been giving thought to all of this.

Now, from the standpoint of your Commission, we recognize your interest in the problem and we would be very grateful to get any guidance that you could give us, either now or later, with respect to the problem, particularly to any guidance that would keep us from going down any blind alleys or getting involved in something in which, in the final analysis, would be completely impractical and unsupportable by you people here.

We have very little time for this job. We have to submit our report by the first of June and as a result we have to short-cut as much as we can.

Obviously, our report is not going to immediately generate construction activity. We hope that it will generate some serious thinking and possibly will result in the initiation of some moves toward getting the job done.

Meanwhile, we want our report to be as practical and as useful as possible and that is one of the reasons we are here."

18 April 1955

Honorable Charles A. Buckley
Chairman, Committee on Public Works
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Buckley:

At a meeting on 13 April 1955 the Commission of Fine Arts considered H. R. 2968 and H. R. 3110, two identical bills, to establish a commission to prepare a plan for the removal of temporary government buildings in the District of Columbia, for the accomodation in other buildings of the personnel employed in such temporary buildings and for other purposes.

As requested in your letter of 1 April 1955, the members discussed the provisions of the bills in detail and they unanimously endorsed the establishment of the commission proposed in the legislation. The removal of the temporary buildings from the monumental areas of the District of Columbia has long been an aim of the Commission.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT G

EXHIBIT C

From Your Congressman
JOEL T. BROYHILL
House of Representatives
Washington 25, D. C.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2968

Same as H.R. 3110

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 25, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To establish a Commission to prepare a plan for the removal of temporary Government buildings in the District of Columbia, for the accommodation in other buildings of the personnel employed in such temporary buildings, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the "Commission for the Removal of Temporary Government Buildings in the District of Columbia" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of seven Commissioners as follows: the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of

General Services, and five Commissioners to be appointed by the President—one from among the members of the National Capital Planning Commission, one from among the members of the Commission of Fine Arts, and three from private life.

SEC. 2. (a) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) The President shall designate one of the Commissioners as chairman.

(c) A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(d) The Commissioners shall serve without compensation as such, but they shall be reimbursed, upon vouchers signed by the Chairman, for necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the functions vested in them by this Act.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and prescribe the duties, and fix the compensation, of such employees as may be necessary for the execution of its functions.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall prepare a plan (1) for the orderly removal of the temporary buildings erected in the District of Columbia by the United States since the

beginning of World War I, and (2) for the accommodation of the personnel occupying such temporary buildings in one or more buildings to be constructed or leased in the District of Columbia by the United States. In order to promote economy and efficiency in Government and to protect the national security, such plan shall provide for the construction or leasing of the minimum number of buildings necessary to accommodate such personnel and for the equipment of each such building with shelters designed to protect both personnel and Government documents in the event of an enemy attack with atomic or hydrogen bombs. An estimate of the cost of such plan shall be included therein.

(b) The Commission shall submit a report containing its plan to the President not later than December 31, 1955.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist on the thirtieth day following the date of submission of such report.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2968

A BILL

To establish a Commission to prepare a plan for the removal of temporary Government buildings in the District of Columbia, for the accommodation in other buildings of the personnel employed in such temporary buildings, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BROYHILL

JANUARY 25, 1955
Referred to the Committee on Public Works

COPY

WASHINGTON-METROPOLITAN CHAPTER
OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, INC.
1612 "I" Street, N. W.,Washington 6, D. C.

Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings
L. M. Leisenring, Chairman.

April 1, 1955.

The Fine Arts Commission
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

In re: Preservation of Old Patent Office Building.

Gentlemen:

Representing The American Institute of Architects as Preservation Officer for this area and also as Chairman of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter, A.I.A. Committee on the Preservation of Historic Buildings, I respectfully request and urge that you disapprove and oppose the proposal to demolish the Old Patent Office Building, as proposed in the two bills H. R. 4687 and H. R. 4841, 84th Congress, 1st Session. The intent of these measures is to authorize the Administrator of General Services to "dispose of the Civil Service Commission Building, fomerly known as the Patent Office Building, and the site thereof" . . . "to make available a site" . . . "for the erection by private enterprise of a building for the parking of motor vehicles" . . . Similar bills were introduced in the 83rd Congress, 1st Session, namely S. 2541 and H. R. 6542. These were vigorously opposed by many influential men and organizations and were not enacted.

Consideration will, I am sure, convince you that the proposal to destroy this useful and monumental building cannot be defended and for the following reasons -

1. It is a building of great historic interest and architectural merit. The site is one established by the original L'Enfant Plan for the city as one for an important Federal Building, and on it in 1836, in the Administration of President Jackson, its construction was begun from the design of Robert Mills of South Carolina. Mills was the first architect completely trained in America, being also the architect of the U.S. Treasury Building, the Washington Monument here, and in Baltimore. The building is monumental in character, of the finest white marble, and one of the very best examples of the adaptation of the Greek Classic to modern use.

   Note: A part of the original facade on F St. is Aquia Greek Sandstone.

IML

EXHIBIT H

COPY

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN CHAPTER
OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, INC.
1612 "I" Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings
L. M. Leisenring, Chairman.

April 1, 1935.

The Fine Arts Commission
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

In re: Preservation of Old Patent Office Building.

Gentlemen:

Representing The American Institute of Architects as Preservation Officer for this area and also as Chairman of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter, A.I.A. Committee on the Preservation of Historic Buildings, I respectfully request and urge that you disapprove and oppose the proposal to demolish the Old Patent Office Building, as proposed in the two bills H. R. 4687 and H. R. 4814, 84th Congress, 1st Session. The intent of these measures is to authorize the Administrator of General Services to "dispose of the Civil Service Commission Building, formerly known as the Patent Office Building, and the site thereof" . . . "to make available a site" . . . "for the erection by private enterprise of a building for the parking of motor vehicles" . . . Similar bills were introduced in the 83rd Congress, 1st Session, namely S. 2241 and H. R. 6542. These were vigorously opposed by many influential men and organizations and were not enacted.

Consideration will, I am sure, convince you that the proposal to destroy this useful and monumental building cannot be defended and for the following reasons -

1. It is a building of great historic interest and architectural merit. The site is one established by the original L'Enfant Plan for the city as one for an important Federal Building, and on it in 1836, in the Administration of President Jackson, the construction was begun from the design of Robert Mills of South Carolina. Mills was the first architect completely trained in America, being also the architect of the U.S. Treasury Building, the Washington Monument here, and in Baltimore. The building is monumental in character, of the finest white marble, and one of the very best examples of the adaptation of the Greek Classic to modern use.

Note: A part of the original facade on F St. is Aquia Greek Sandstone.

LML

EXHIBIT H

COPY

2. Investigation proves it to be one of the most efficiently used and economically administered of the Federal Buildings of Washington. With federal bureaus housed in wartime temporary shacks throughout the city and with blighted areas calling for slum clearance - some of these in the near vicinity making other nearby areas available for off-street parking - the destruction of this substantial structure cannot be defended as an economic measure.

3. As a matter of location, the concentration in this congested area of hundreds of motor vehicles in a multi-storied structure, with the necessary entrances and exits, surrounded by four heavily travelled streets, each with active rapid transit lines, would be contrary to all rules of city planning. If the need of off-street parking in this general area is the point stressed by this proposal, it should be considered that this need may very well be otherwise met and even now be acceptably planned by private enterprise, such as the published plans for the proposed Bus Terminal with its parking facilities for this area, without the destruction of valuable government property.

4. From a national standpoint 1st it be said that the American People take great pride in their Capital and have great interest in its historic development. The Old Patent Office Building stands as one of its early architectural monuments. Witness the many proptests from far and wide that have been sent in to their legislators proptesting this desecration. You may be sure that these will be repeated now that this unfortunate proposal has again been put forward.

5. It will be well to recall some of the actions of disapproval when this proposal was made to the 83rd Congress.
Disapproved by:

The National Commission of Fine Arts
The American Institute of Architects
The Washington Federation of Citizens Associations
The Columbia Historical Society
The Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities
The Society for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities

It is presumed that this matter will be referred again to the Planning Commission as it vitally affects the city plan. With this in mind I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to them.

Yours respectfully,

(signed)

L. M. Leisenring,
Preservation Officer
Washington-Metropolitan Area.

COPY

COPY

2. Investigation proves it to be one of the most efficiently used and economically administered of the Federal Buildings of Washington. With federal bureaus housed in various temporary shacks throughout the city and with blighted areas calling for slum clearance - some of these in the near vicinity making other nearby areas available for off-street parking - the destruction of this substantial structure cannot be defended as an economic measure.

3. As a matter of location, the concentration in this congested area of hundreds of motor vehicles in a multi-storied structure, with the necessary entrances and exits, surrounded by four heavily traveled streets, each with active rapid transit lines, would be contrary to all rules of city planning. If the need of off-street parking in this general area is the point stressed by this proposal, it should be considered that this need may very well be otherwise met and even now be acceptably planned by private enterprise, such as the published plans for the proposed Bus Terminal with its parking facilities for this area, without the destruction of valuable government property.

4. From a national standpoint let it be said that the American People take great pride in their Capital and have great interest in its historic development. The Old Patent Office Building stands as one of its early architectural monuments. Witness the many prospects from far and wide that have been sent in to their Legislators prospecting this desecration. You may be sure that these will be repeated now that this unfortunate proposal has again been put forward.

5. It will be well to recall some of the actions of disapproval when this proposal was made to the 83rd Congress.
Disapproved by:
The National Commission of Fine Arts
The American Institute of Architects
The Washington Federation of Citizens Associations
The Columbia Historical Society
The Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities
The Society for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities

It is presumed that this matter will be referred again to the Planning Commission as it vitally affects the city plan. With this in mind I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to them.

Yours respectfully,

(signed)

L. M. Leisenring,
Preservation Officer
Washington-Metropolitan Area

COPY

14 April 1955

Mr. L. M. Leisenring, Chairman
Committee on Preservation of
Historic Buildings
American Institute of Architects
1612 "I" Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Mr. Leisenring:

I have your letter of 1 April 1955 which outlines the position of your Committee in opposing the razing of the Old Patent Office as proposed in H. R. 4687 and H. R. 4841-84th Congress. The interest and support of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter is greatly appreciated.

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts are unanimous that this building should not be destroyed and a report to this effect is now going forward to the Congress.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

COPY

EXHIBIT H-1

COPY

2. Investigation proves it to be one of the most efficiently used and economically administered of the Federal Buildings of Washington. With federal bureaus housed in wartime temporary shacks throughout the city and with blighted areas calling for slum clearance - some of these in the near vicinity making other nearby areas available for off-street parking - the destruction of this substantial structure cannot be defended as an economic measure.

3. As a matter of location, the concentration in this congested area of hundreds of motor vehicles in a multi-storied structure, with the necessary entrances and exits, surrounded by four heavily traveled streets, each with active rapid transit lines, would be contrary to all rules of city planning. If the need of off-street parking in this general area is the point stressed by this proposal, it should be considered that this need may very well be otherwise met and even now be acceptably planned by private enterprise, such as the published plans for the proposed Bus Terminal with its parking facilities for this area, without the destruction of valuable government property.

4. From a national standpoint let it be said that the American People take great pride in their Capital and have great interest in its historic development. The Old Patent Office Building stands as one of its early architectural monuments. Witness the many projects from far and wide that have been sent in to their Legislators proposing this desecration. You may be sure that these will be repeated now that this unfortunate proposal has again been put forward.

5. It will be well to recall some of the actions of disapproval when this proposal was made to the 83rd Congress.
Disapproved by:
The National Commission of Fine Arts
The American Institute of Architects
The Washington Federation of Citizens Associations
The Columbia Historical Society
The Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities
The Society for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities

It is presumed that this matter will be referred again to the Planning Commission as it vitally affects the city plan. With this in mind I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to them.

Yours respectfully,

(signed)

I. M. Leisenring,
Preservation Officer
Washington Metropolitan Area

COPY

14 April 1955

Mr. L. M. Leisenring, Chairman
Committee on Preservation of
Historic Buildings
American Institute of Architects
1612 "I" Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Mr. Leisenring:

I have your letter of 1 April 1955 which outlines the position of your Committee in opposing the razing of the Old Patent Office as proposed in H. R. 4687 and H. R. 4841-84th Congress. The interest and support of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter is greatly appreciated.

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts are unanimous that this building should not be destroyed and a report to this effect is now going forward to the Congress.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

COPY

EXHIBIT H-1

COPY

14 April 1955

Mr. L. M. Leisenring, Chairman
Committee on Preservation of
Historic Buildings
American Institute of Architects
1612 "I" Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Mr. Leisenring:

I have your letter of 1 April 1955 which outlines the position of your Committee in opposing the razing of the Old Patent Office as proposed in H. R. 4687 and H. R. 4841-84th Congress. The interest and support of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter is greatly appreciated.

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts are unanimous that this building should not be destroyed and a report to this effect is now going forward to the Congress.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

COPY

EXHIBIT H-1

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF DESIGN
1083 Fifth Avenue, New York 28, N. Y.
Founded 1825

April 8, 1955

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Your letter of March 21st addressed to my predecessor, Mr. Eliot Clark, was discussed at the meeting of the Council of the National Academy of Design. It was agreed that Messrs. Norman Kent, Fritz Eichenberg and Anthony de Francisci would serve with the Commission of Fine Arts as an advisory committee on stamps.

Our committee accepted the remuneration proposed in the last paragraph of your letter, but as they are busy men arrangements could perhaps be made to have meetings weekends, or that the gentlemen of your committee come to New York for consultations. We trust that this detail can be worked out to everyone's satisfaction.

Sincerely yours,

(signed)

Ernest Fiene, N.A.
Corresponding Secretary

EF/m

EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF DESIGN
1083 Fifth Avenue, New York 28, N. Y.
Founded 1825

April 8, 1955

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Your letter of March 21st addressed to my predecessor, Mr. Millet Stark, was discussed at the meeting of the Council of the National Academy of Design. It was agreed that Thomas Hart Benton and Anthony de Francisci would serve with the Commission of Fine Arts as an advisory committee on sculpture.

Our committee accepted the remuneration proposed in the last paragraph of your letter, but as they are busy men engagements could perhaps be made to have meetings weekends, or that the scheduled of your committee come to New York for consultation. We trust that this detail can be worked out to everyone's satisfaction.

Sincerely yours,

(signed)

Ernest Fiene, N.A.
Corresponding Secretary

EF/m

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

18 April 1955

Mr. Ernest Fiene
Corresponding Secretary
National Academy of Design
1083 Fifth Avenue
New York 28, New York

Dear Mr. Fiene:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on 13 April 1955, the members discussed your letter of 8 April 1955 relating to conditions affecting reimbursement of the advisory committee on stamps. The Commission as well as the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving were pleased that your committee had agreed to advise the Government without remuneration other than actual expenses that might be involved.

The present arrangements are in themselves still considered to be preliminary and it may be possible to work out other conditions as the results become evident. For the time being, the representatives of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing have expressed themselves as willing to meet the committee in New York on weekends or at such other time as will be convenient to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

cc to: Mr. Albert J. Robertson
Asst. Postmaster General
Post Office Department
Mr. H. J. Holtzclaw
Associate Director
Bureau of Engraving and Printing

EXHIBIT I-1

EXHIBIT I-1